arXiv:1003.5973v1 [math.NT] 31 Mar 2010

THE BOWMAN-BRADLEY THEOREM FOR MULTIPLE ZETA-STAR VALUES

HIROKI KONDO, SHINGO SAITO, AND TATSUSHI TANAKA

Abstract. The Bowman-Bradley theorem asserts that the multiple zeta values at the sequences obtained by inserting a fixed number of twos between $3, 1, \dots, 3, 1$ add up to a rational multiple of a power of π. We establish its counterpart for multiple zeta-star values by showing an identity in a non-commutative polynomial algebra introduced by Hoffman.

1. Introduction

For $k_1, \dots, k_n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ with $k_1 \geq 2$, the multiple zeta value (MZV) and the multiple zeta-star value (MZSV) are defined by

$$\zeta(k_1, \dots, k_n) = \sum_{m_1 > \dots > m_n > 0} \frac{1}{m_1^{k_1} \cdots m_n^{k_n}}, \quad \zeta^\star(k_1, \dots, k_n) = \sum_{m_1 \geq \dots \geq m_n > 0} \frac{1}{m_1^{k_1} \cdots m_n^{k_n}},$$

respectively. When $n = 1$, the MZVs and MZSVs coincide and reduce to the values of the Riemann zeta function at positive integers. Euler [Eul68] found that the Riemann zeta values at even positive integers are rational multiples of powers of π^2:

$$\zeta(2k) = -\frac{B_{2k}(2\pi\sqrt{-1})^{2k}}{2(2k)!},$$

where the rational numbers B_{2k} are the Bernoulli numbers given by

$$\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} B_m \frac{t^m}{m!} = \frac{te^t}{e^t - 1}.$$

This result has been generalized to MZVs (Hoffman [Hof92], Ohno-Zagier [OZ01], Yamasaki [Yam09], etc.) and MZSVs (Hoffman [Hof92], Aoki-Kombu-Ohno [AKO08], Zlobin [Zlo05], Muneta [Mun08], etc.): for $k, n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$, we have

$$\zeta(\{2k\}^n), \zeta^\star(\{2k\}^n) \in \mathbb{Q}\pi^{2kn}.$$

Here and throughout, we write

$$\{k_1, \dots, k_l\}^m = \underbrace{k_1, \dots, k_l, k_1, \dots, k_l, \dots, k_1, \dots, k_l}_{lm}.$$

It has also been shown that

$$\zeta(\{3, 1\}^n), \zeta^\star(\{3, 1\}^n) \in \mathbb{Q}\pi^{4n}$$

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 11M32(primary), 05A19 (secondary).

Key words and phrases. multiple zeta values, multiple zeta-star values, Bowman-Bradley theorem, harmonic algebra.

for $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$, by Borwein-Bradley-Broadhurst-Lisoněk [BBBL98] and Kontsevich-Zagier [KZ01] for MZVs and by Zlobin [Zlo05] and Muneta [Mun08] for MZSVs. Furthermore, Bowman-Bradley [BB02] obtained

$$\sum_{\substack{\sum_{i=0}^{2n} m_i = m \\ m_0,\dots,m_{2n} \geq 0}} \zeta(\{2\}^{m_0}, 3, \{2\}^{m_1}, 1, \{2\}^{m_2}, \dots, 3, \{2\}^{m_{2n-1}}, 1, \{2\}^{m_{2n}}) \in \mathbb{Q}\pi^{2m+4n}$$

for $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ and $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$. However, its counterpart for MZSVs has been proved only partially: the $m = 1$ case by Muneta [Mun08] and $m = 2$ by Imatomi-Tanaka-Tasaka-Wakabayashi [ITTW09]. In the present paper, we establish the complete counterpart by showing that

$$\sum_{\substack{\sum_{i=0}^{2n} m_i = m \\ m_0,\dots,m_{2n} \geq 0}} \zeta^\star(\{2\}^{m_0}, 3, \{2\}^{m_1}, 1, \{2\}^{m_2}, \dots, 3, \{2\}^{m_{2n-1}}, 1, \{2\}^{m_{2n}}) \in \mathbb{Q}\pi^{2m+4n}$$

for all $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ and $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$. Note that this is valid when $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ and $n = 0$ because $\zeta^\star(\{2\}^m) \in \mathbb{Q}\pi^{2m}$ as mentioned above, and also clearly valid when $m = n = 0$ because of the convention that the value of $\zeta^\star$ at the empty sequence $\emptyset$ is 1. Therefore our main theorem reads as follows:

Theorem 1.1 (Main Theorem)**.** *For all $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, we have*

$$\sum_{\substack{\sum_{i=0}^{2n} m_i = m \\ m_0,\dots,m_{2n} \geq 0}} \zeta^\star(\{2\}^{m_0}, 3, \{2\}^{m_1}, 1, \{2\}^{m_2}, \dots, 3, \{2\}^{m_{2n-1}}, 1, \{2\}^{m_{2n}}) \in \mathbb{Q}\pi^{2m+4n}.$$

2. Reduction to an algebraic identity

2.1. **Hoffman's algebraic setup.** We first reduce our main theorem to an identity in the algebra introduced by Hoffman [Hof97]. Our definitions of operations are superficially different from those given by Hoffman, as we intend to define similar operations on another algebra later in a unified manner that is convenient to prove the key algebraic identity. It will be seen that our definitions are essentially the same as Hoffman's.

Let $\mathfrak{H} = \mathbb{Q}\langle x, y\rangle$ be the non-commutative polynomial algebra over the rational numbers in two indeterminates x and y, and denote the subalgebras $\mathbb{Q} + \mathfrak{H}y$ and $\mathbb{Q} + x\mathfrak{H}y$ of $\mathfrak{H}$ by $\mathfrak{H}^1$ and $\mathfrak{H}^0$, respectively. Write $z_a = x^{a-1}y \in \mathfrak{H}^1$ for $a \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$.

Definition 2.1. An *index* is a finite sequence of positive integers; the empty sequence $\emptyset$ is also regarded as an index. An index is *admissible* if either it is empty or its first component is greater than 1. The sets of all indices and all admissible indices are denoted by I and I_0, respectively.

For $\boldsymbol{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_n) \in I$, put $z_{\boldsymbol{a}} = z_{a_1} \cdots z_{a_n} \in \mathfrak{H}^1$, where $z_\emptyset = 1$. Then it is easy to observe that $\{z_{\boldsymbol{a}} \mid \boldsymbol{a} \in I\}$ and $\{z_{\boldsymbol{a}} \mid \boldsymbol{a} \in I_0\}$ are $\mathbb{Q}$-vector space bases for $\mathfrak{H}^1$ and $\mathfrak{H}^0$, respectively.

Definition 2.2. We define $\mathbb{Q}$-linear maps $Z, \overline{Z}\colon \mathfrak{H}^0 \to \mathbb{R}$ by setting $Z(z_{\boldsymbol{a}}) = \zeta(\boldsymbol{a})$ and $\overline{Z}(z_{\boldsymbol{a}}) = \zeta^\star(\boldsymbol{a})$ for $\boldsymbol{a} \in I_0$, where $\zeta(\emptyset) = \zeta^\star(\emptyset) = 1$.

For $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, set $[n] = \{1, \dots, n\}$, where $[0] = \emptyset$. Recall that for every $l \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, there exists a unique map from $[0]$ to $[l]$, denoted by $\emptyset$, and it is strictly increasing and has image $[0]$. If $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$, then there is no map from $[n]$ to $[0]$. A map $\sigma\colon [n] \to [l]$ is denoted by

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & \cdots & n \\ \sigma(1) & \cdots & \sigma(n) \end{pmatrix}.$$

2.1.1. *The transformation d.* It is known that if we define a $\mathbb{Q}$-linear transformation d on $\mathfrak{H}^1$ by setting $d(1) = 1$ and $d(wy) = \varphi(w)y$ for $w \in \mathfrak{H}$, where φ is an automorphism on $\mathfrak{H}$ satisfying $\varphi(1) = 1$, $\varphi(x) = x$ and $\varphi(y) = x + y$, then we have $\overline{Z} = Z \circ d$ on $\mathfrak{H}^0$. Here we give an alternative equivalent definition of d:

Definition 2.3. For $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, we write S_n^d for the set of all pairs (l, σ) of $l \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ and $\sigma\colon [n] \to [l]$ that is nondecreasing and surjective. We define a $\mathbb{Q}$-linear transformation d on $\mathfrak{H}^1$ by setting

$$d(z_{\boldsymbol{a}}) = \sum_{(l,\sigma) \in S_n^d} z_{\boldsymbol{c}}$$

for $\boldsymbol{a} = (a_1, \ldots, a_n) \in I$, where $\boldsymbol{c} = (c_1, \ldots, c_l) \in I$ is given by

$$c_i = \sum_{s \in \sigma^{-1}(i)} a_s$$

for $i \in [l]$.

Remark 2.4. In Definition 2.3, we suppressed the explicit dependence of $\boldsymbol{c}$ on $\boldsymbol{a}$, l, σ in the notation for simplicity. We will occasionally employ a similar abuse of notation in what follows when there is no ambiguity.

Example 2.5. For $n = 0$, we have $S_0^d = \{(0, \emptyset)\}$ and so $d(1) = 1$.

For $n = 1$, we have

$$S_1^d = \left\{ \left(1, \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \right) \right\}$$

and so

$$d(z_{a_1}) = z_{a_1}$$

for $a_1 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$.

For $n = 2$, we have

$$S_2^d = \left\{ \left(1, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right), \left(2, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix} \right) \right\}$$

and so

$$d(z_{a_1} z_{a_2}) = z_{a_1 + a_2} + z_{a_1} z_{a_2}$$

for $a_1, a_2 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$.

For $n = 3$, we have

$$S_3^d = \left\{ \left(1, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & 3 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right), \left(2, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & 3 \\ 1 & 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix} \right), \left(2, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & 3 \\ 1 & 2 & 2 \end{pmatrix} \right), \left(3, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & 3 \\ 1 & 2 & 3 \end{pmatrix} \right) \right\}$$

and so

$$d(z_{a_1} z_{a_2} z_{a_3}) = z_{a_1 + a_2 + a_3} + z_{a_1 + a_2} z_{a_3} + z_{a_1} z_{a_2 + a_3} + z_{a_1} z_{a_2} z_{a_3}$$

for $a_1, a_2, a_3 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$.

Remark 2.6. If $(l, \sigma) \in S_n^d$, then $l \leq n$.

Proposition 2.7. *The transformation d defined in Definition 2.3 is the same as the one defined immediately before Definition 2.3. It follows that $\overline{Z} = Z \circ d$ on $\mathfrak{H}^0$.*

Proof. It suffices to prove that

$$(\natural) \qquad d(z_{a_1} \cdots z_{a_n}) = x^{a_1-1}(x+y) \cdots x^{a_{n-1}-1}(x+y)x^{a_n-1}y$$

if $n \geq 2$ and $a_1, \ldots, a_n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$. For each $(l, \sigma) \in S_n^d$, setting $c_i = \sum_{s \in \sigma^{-1}(i)} a_s$ for $i \in [l]$, we have

$$z_{c_1} \cdots z_{c_l} = x^{a_1-1}u_1 \cdots x^{a_{n-1}-1}u_{n-1}x^{a_n-1}y,$$

where $u_s = x$ if $\sigma(s) = \sigma(s+1)$ and $u_s = y$ if $\sigma(s) + 1 = \sigma(s+1)$ for $s \in [n-1]$. This gives a one-to-one correspondence between the elements of S_n^d and the terms that appear in the expansion of the right-hand side of ($\natural$). ☐

2.1.2. *The binary operations $*$ and $\widetilde{ш}$.* Hoffman [Hof92] defined a $\mathbb{Q}$-bilinear map $*\colon \mathfrak{H}^1 \times \mathfrak{H}^1 \to \mathfrak{H}^1$, called the harmonic product, by setting $w * 1 = 1 * w = w$ and $z_a w * z_b w' = z_a(w * z_b w') + z_b(z_a w * w') + z_{a+b}(w * w')$ for $w, w' \in \mathfrak{H}^1$, whereas Muneta [Mun09] defined a $\mathbb{Q}$-bilinear map $\widetilde{ш}\colon \mathfrak{H}^1 \times \mathfrak{H}^1 \to \mathfrak{H}^1$ by setting $w \mathbin{\widetilde{ш}} 1 = 1 \mathbin{\widetilde{ш}} w = w$ and $z_a w \mathbin{\widetilde{ш}} z_b w' = z_a(w \mathbin{\widetilde{ш}} z_b w') + z_b(z_a w \mathbin{\widetilde{ш}} w')$ for $w, w' \in \mathfrak{H}^1$. Here we give alternative equivalent definitions of $*$ and $\widetilde{ш}$:

Definition 2.8. Let $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. We write $S_{m,n}^*$ for the set of all triples (l, σ, τ) of $l \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, $\sigma\colon [m] \to [l]$ and $\tau\colon [n] \to [l]$ such that σ and τ are strictly increasing and satisfy $\operatorname{Im}\sigma \cup \operatorname{Im}\tau = [l]$. We also write $S_{m,n}^{\widetilde{ш}}$ for the set of those $(l, \sigma, \tau) \in S_{m,n}^*$ for which $\operatorname{Im}\sigma \cap \operatorname{Im}\tau = \emptyset$.

Define $\mathbb{Q}$-bilinear maps $*, \widetilde{ш}\colon \mathfrak{H}^1 \times \mathfrak{H}^1 \to \mathfrak{H}^1$ by setting

$$z_{\boldsymbol{a}} * z_{\boldsymbol{b}} = \sum_{(l,\sigma,\tau) \in S_{m,n}^*} z_{\boldsymbol{c}}, \qquad z_{\boldsymbol{a}} \mathbin{\widetilde{ш}} z_{\boldsymbol{b}} = \sum_{(l,\sigma,\tau) \in S_{m,n}^{\widetilde{ш}}} z_{\boldsymbol{c}}$$

for $\boldsymbol{a} = (a_1, \ldots, a_m), \boldsymbol{b} = (b_1, \ldots, b_n) \in I$, where $\boldsymbol{c} = (c_1, \ldots, c_l) \in I$ is given by

$$c_i = \sum_{s \in \sigma^{-1}(i)} a_s + \sum_{t \in \tau^{-1}(i)} b_t$$

for $i \in [l]$.

Example 2.9. For $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ and $n = 0$, we have $S_{m,0}^* = S_{m,0}^{\widetilde{ш}} = \{(m, \mathrm{id}_{[m]}, \emptyset)\}$ and so

$$z_{\boldsymbol{a}} * 1 = z_{\boldsymbol{a}} \mathbin{\widetilde{ш}} 1 = z_{\boldsymbol{a}}$$

for all $\boldsymbol{a} \in I$.

For $m = n = 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} S_{1,1}^* &= \left\{ \left(1, \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}\right), \left(2, \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 2 \end{pmatrix}\right), \left(2, \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 2 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}\right) \right\}, \\ S_{1,1}^{\widetilde{ш}} &= \left\{ \left(2, \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 2 \end{pmatrix}\right), \left(2, \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 2 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}\right) \right\} \end{aligned}$$

and so

$$z_{a_1} * z_{b_1} = z_{a_1+b_1} + z_{a_1}z_{b_1} + z_{b_1}z_{a_1}, \qquad z_{a_1} \mathbin{\widetilde{ш}} z_{b_1} = z_{a_1}z_{b_1} + z_{b_1}z_{a_1}$$

for $a_1, b_1 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$.

For $m = 2$ and $n = 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
S^{*}_{2,1} = \Bigg\{ &\left(2, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}\right), \left(2, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 2 \end{pmatrix}\right), \\
&\left(3, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 3 \end{pmatrix}\right), \left(3, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ 1 & 3 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 2 \end{pmatrix}\right), \left(3, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ 2 & 3 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}\right) \Bigg\}, \\
S^{\widetilde{\shuffle}}_{2,1} = \Bigg\{ &\left(3, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 3 \end{pmatrix}\right), \left(3, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ 1 & 3 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 2 \end{pmatrix}\right), \left(3, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ 2 & 3 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}\right) \Bigg\}
\end{aligned}$$

and so

$$\begin{aligned}
z_{a_1} z_{a_2} * z_{b_1} &= z_{a_1+b_1} z_{a_2} + z_{a_1} z_{a_2+b_1} + z_{a_1} z_{a_2} z_{b_1} + z_{a_1} z_{b_1} z_{a_2} + z_{b_1} z_{a_1} z_{a_2}, \\
z_{a_1} z_{a_2} \,\widetilde{\shuffle}\, z_{b_1} &= \phantom{z_{a_1+b_1} z_{a_2} + z_{a_1} z_{a_2+b_1} +{}} z_{a_1} z_{a_2} z_{b_1} + z_{a_1} z_{b_1} z_{a_2} + z_{b_1} z_{a_1} z_{a_2}
\end{aligned}$$

for $a_1, a_2, b_1 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$.

Remark 2.10. If $(l, \sigma, \tau) \in S^{*}_{m,n}$, then $\max\{m, n\} \leq l \leq m + n$; if $(l, \sigma, \tau) \in S^{\widetilde{\shuffle}}_{m,n}$, then $l = m + n$.

Proposition 2.11. *The map $*$ defined above is the same as the one defined by Hoffman* [Hof92]. *It follows that $*$ is an associative and commutative product with respect to which Z is homomorphic, i.e., $Z(w * w') = Z(w)Z(w')$ for all $w, w' \in \mathfrak{H}^0$.*

Proof. It suffices to prove that

$$z_a z_{\boldsymbol{a}'} * z_b z_{\boldsymbol{b}'} = z_a(z_{\boldsymbol{a}'} * z_b z_{\boldsymbol{b}'}) + z_b(z_a z_{\boldsymbol{a}'} * z_{\boldsymbol{b}'}) + z_{a+b}(z_{\boldsymbol{a}'} * z_{\boldsymbol{b}'})$$

for $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ and $\boldsymbol{a}', \boldsymbol{b}' \in I$. Consider the maps

$$\begin{aligned}
S^{*}_{m,n+1} &\to S^{*}_{m+1,n+1}; (l, \sigma, \tau) \mapsto (l + 1, \tilde{\sigma}, \tau + 1), \\
S^{*}_{m+1,n} &\to S^{*}_{m+1,n+1}; (l, \sigma, \tau) \mapsto (l + 1, \sigma + 1, \tilde{\tau}), \\
S^{*}_{m,n} &\to S^{*}_{m+1,n+1}; (l, \sigma, \tau) \mapsto (l + 1, \tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{\tau}),
\end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{\sigma}$, $\sigma + 1$, $\tilde{\tau}$, $\tau + 1$ are given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\sigma} &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & \cdots & m+1 \\ 1 & \sigma(1)+1 & \cdots & \sigma(m)+1 \end{pmatrix}, & \sigma + 1 &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \cdots & m+1 \\ \sigma(1)+1 & \cdots & \sigma(m+1)+1 \end{pmatrix}, \\
\tilde{\tau} &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & \cdots & n+1 \\ 1 & \tau(1)+1 & \cdots & \tau(n)+1 \end{pmatrix}, & \tau + 1 &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \cdots & n+1 \\ \tau(1)+1 & \cdots & \tau(n+1)+1 \end{pmatrix}.
\end{aligned}$$

They are injective and their images are disjoint sets with union $S^{*}_{m+1,n+1}$. This completes the proof. □

Proposition 2.12. *The map $\widetilde{\shuffle}$ defined above is the same as the one defined by Muneta* [Mun09]. *It follows that $\widetilde{\shuffle}$ is an associative and commutative product.*

Proof. It suffices to prove that

$$z_a z_{\boldsymbol{a}'} \,\widetilde{\shuffle}\, z_b z_{\boldsymbol{b}'} = z_a(z_{\boldsymbol{a}'} \,\widetilde{\shuffle}\, z_b z_{\boldsymbol{b}'}) + z_b(z_a z_{\boldsymbol{a}'} \,\widetilde{\shuffle}\, z_{\boldsymbol{b}'})$$

for $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ and $\boldsymbol{a}', \boldsymbol{b}' \in I$. Consider the maps

$$\begin{aligned}
S^{\widetilde{\shuffle}}_{m,n+1} &\to S^{\widetilde{\shuffle}}_{m+1,n+1}; (l, \sigma, \tau) \mapsto (l + 1, \tilde{\sigma}, \tau + 1), \\
S^{\widetilde{\shuffle}}_{m+1,n} &\to S^{\widetilde{\shuffle}}_{m+1,n+1}; (l, \sigma, \tau) \mapsto (l + 1, \sigma + 1, \tilde{\tau}),
\end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{\sigma}$, $\sigma + 1$, $\tilde{\tau}$, $\tau + 1$ are given in the preceding proof. They are injective and their images are disjoint sets with union $S^{\widetilde{\shuffle}}_{m+1,n+1}$. This completes the proof. □

The product $\widetilde{\sqcup\!\sqcup}$ allows us to write our main theorem (Theorem 1.1) in the following simple form:

Theorem 2.13 (Main Theorem)**.** *For all $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, we have*

$$\overline{Z}\bigl(z_2^m \mathbin{\widetilde{\sqcup\!\sqcup}} (z_3 z_1)^n\bigr) \in \mathbb{Q}\pi^{2m+4n}.$$

2.2. **Reduction of our main theorem to an identity in $\mathfrak{H}^1$.** The aim of this subsection is to reduce our main theorem to the following identity in $\mathfrak{H}^1$:

Theorem 2.14. *For all $a, b, c \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ and $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{\substack{i+p+2q=m\\ j+u_1+\cdots+u_p\\ +v_1+\cdots+v_q=n}} &(-2)^p d\bigl(z_c^i \mathbin{\widetilde{\sqcup\!\sqcup}} (z_a z_b)^j\bigr) * \bigl(z_{(a+b)u_1+c}\cdots z_{(a+b)u_p+c} \mathbin{\sqcup\!\sqcup} z_{(a+b)v_1+2c}\cdots z_{(a+b)v_q+2c}\bigr)\\ &= (-1)^m \sum_{j+k=n} \bigl(z_c^m \mathbin{\widetilde{\sqcup\!\sqcup}} (z_a z_b)^j\bigr) * d(z_{a+b}^k).\end{aligned}$$

Assuming Theorem 2.14 hereafter within this subsection, we will give a proof of our main theorem.

Definition 2.15. A *partition* of a set X is a family of pairwise disjoint nonempty subsets of X with union X. For $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$, the collection of all partitions of $[n]$ is denoted by Π_n.

Example 2.16. For $n = 3$, we have

$$\Pi_3 = \Bigl\{\bigl\{\{1\},\{2\},\{3\}\bigr\}, \bigl\{\{1,2\},\{3\}\bigr\}, \bigl\{\{1,3\},\{2\}\bigr\}, \bigl\{\{2,3\},\{1\}\bigr\}, \bigl\{\{1,2,3\}\bigr\}\Bigr\}.$$

Lemma 2.17. *For all $a_1, \dots, a_n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$, we have*

$$z_{a_1} * \cdots * z_{a_n} = \sum_{\mathcal{P} \in \Pi_n} \widetilde{\coprod\!\!\coprod_{A \in \mathcal{P}}} z_{\sum_{i \in A} a_i}.$$

Proof. Easy. Also see [Hof92]. □

Example 2.18. For $n = 3$, we have

$$z_{a_1} * z_{a_2} * z_{a_3} = z_{a_1} \mathbin{\widetilde{\sqcup\!\sqcup}} z_{a_2} \mathbin{\widetilde{\sqcup\!\sqcup}} z_{a_3} + z_{a_1+a_2} \mathbin{\widetilde{\sqcup\!\sqcup}} z_{a_3} + z_{a_1+a_3} \mathbin{\widetilde{\sqcup\!\sqcup}} z_{a_2} + z_{a_2+a_3} \mathbin{\widetilde{\sqcup\!\sqcup}} z_{a_1} + z_{a_1+a_2+a_3}.$$

Lemma 2.19. *If $a_1, \dots, a_n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ are all even, then*

$$Z(z_{a_1} \mathbin{\widetilde{\sqcup\!\sqcup}} \cdots \mathbin{\widetilde{\sqcup\!\sqcup}} z_{a_n}) \in \mathbb{Q}\pi^{a_1+\cdots+a_n}.$$

Proof. We proceed by induction on n. For $n = 1$, the assertion is obvious because

$$Z(z_{a_1}) = \zeta(a_1) \in \mathbb{Q}\pi^{a_1}.$$

Suppose that the lemma holds for $1, \dots, n-1$. Applying Z to Lemma 2.17 gives

$$\begin{aligned}\zeta(a_1)\cdots\zeta(a_n) &= Z\Biggl(\sum_{\mathcal{P} \in \Pi_n} \widetilde{\coprod\!\!\coprod_{A \in \mathcal{P}}} z_{\sum_{i \in A} a_i}\Biggr)\\ &= Z(z_{a_1} \mathbin{\widetilde{\sqcup\!\sqcup}} \cdots \mathbin{\widetilde{\sqcup\!\sqcup}} z_{a_n}) + \sum_{\mathcal{P} \in \Pi_n \setminus \{\{\{1\},\dots,\{n\}\}\}} Z\Biggl(\widetilde{\coprod\!\!\coprod_{A \in \mathcal{P}}} z_{\sum_{i \in A} a_i}\Biggr).\end{aligned}$$

If $\mathcal{P} \in \Pi_n \setminus \bigl\{\{\{1\},\ldots,\{n\}\}\bigr\}$, then $\mathcal{P}$ has cardinality at most $n-1$, and so the inductive hypothesis shows that

$$Z\left(\mathop{\widetilde{\text{Ш}}}_{A\in\mathcal{P}} z_{\sum_{i\in A} a_i}\right) \in \mathbb{Q}\pi^{\sum_{A\in\mathcal{P}}\sum_{i\in A} a_i} = \mathbb{Q}\pi^{a_1+\cdots+a_n}.$$

It follows that

$$Z(z_{a_1} \mathbin{\widetilde{\text{ш}}} \cdots \mathbin{\widetilde{\text{ш}}} z_{a_n}) = \zeta(a_1)\cdots\zeta(a_n) - \sum_{\mathcal{P}\in\Pi_n\setminus\{\{\{1\},\ldots,\{n\}\}\}} Z\left(\mathop{\widetilde{\text{Ш}}}_{A\in\mathcal{P}} z_{\sum_{i\in A} a_i}\right) \in \mathbb{Q}\pi^{a_1+\cdots+a_n}.$$

$\square$

Lemma 2.20. *For all $p, q, k, l \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, we have*

$$\sum_{\substack{u_1+\cdots+u_p=k\\ v_1+\cdots+v_q=l}} Z\bigl(z_{4u_1+2}\cdots z_{4u_p+2} \mathbin{\widetilde{\text{ш}}} z_{4v_1+4}\cdots z_{4v_q+4}\bigr) \in \mathbb{Q}\pi^{2p+4q+4k+4l}.$$

Proof. We first observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{u_1+\cdots+u_p=k} z_{4u_1+2} \mathbin{\widetilde{\text{ш}}} \cdots \mathbin{\widetilde{\text{ш}}} z_{4u_p+2} &= \sum_{\substack{u_1+\cdots+u_p=k\\ \sigma\in\mathfrak{S}_p}} z_{4u_{\sigma(1)}+2}\cdots z_{4u_{\sigma(p)}+2}\\
&= \sum_{\sigma\in\mathfrak{S}_p}\ \sum_{u_{\sigma(1)}+\cdots+u_{\sigma(p)}=k} z_{4u_{\sigma(1)}+2}\cdots z_{4u_{\sigma(p)}+2}\\
&= \sum_{\sigma\in\mathfrak{S}_p}\ \sum_{u_1+\cdots+u_p=k} z_{4u_1+2}\cdots z_{4u_p+2}\\
&= p! \sum_{u_1+\cdots+u_p=k} z_{4u_1+2}\cdots z_{4u_p+2}.
\end{aligned}$$

This and a similar equation give

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{\substack{u_1+\cdots+u_p=k\\ v_1+\cdots+v_q=l}} z_{4u_1+2}\cdots z_{4u_p+2} \mathbin{\widetilde{\text{ш}}} z_{4v_1+4}\cdots z_{4v_q+4}\\
&\quad= \left(\sum_{u_1+\cdots+u_p=k} z_{4u_1+2}\cdots z_{4u_p+2}\right) \mathbin{\widetilde{\text{ш}}} \left(\sum_{v_1+\cdots+v_q=l} z_{4v_1+4}\cdots z_{4v_q+4}\right)\\
&\quad= \frac{1}{p!}\left(\sum_{u_1+\cdots+u_p=k} z_{4u_1+2} \mathbin{\widetilde{\text{ш}}} \cdots \mathbin{\widetilde{\text{ш}}} z_{4u_p+2}\right) \mathbin{\widetilde{\text{ш}}} \frac{1}{q!}\left(\sum_{v_1+\cdots+v_q=l} z_{4v_1+4} \mathbin{\widetilde{\text{ш}}} \cdots \mathbin{\widetilde{\text{ш}}} z_{4v_q+4}\right)\\
&\quad= \frac{1}{p!q!}\sum_{\substack{u_1+\cdots+u_p=k\\ v_1+\cdots+v_q=l}} z_{4u_1+2} \mathbin{\widetilde{\text{ш}}} \cdots \mathbin{\widetilde{\text{ш}}} z_{4u_p+2} \mathbin{\widetilde{\text{ш}}} z_{4v_1+4} \mathbin{\widetilde{\text{ш}}} \cdots \mathbin{\widetilde{\text{ш}}} z_{4v_q+4}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence the result follows from Lemma 2.19. $\square$

Lemma 2.21. *For all $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, we have*

$$\sum_{j+k=n} Z\bigl(z_2^m \mathbin{\widetilde{\text{ш}}} (z_3z_1)^j\bigr)\overline{Z}(z_4^k) \in \mathbb{Q}\pi^{2m+4n}.$$

Proof. It suffices to show that

$$Z\bigl(z_2^m \mathbin{\widetilde{ш}} (z_3z_1)^j\bigr)\overline{Z}(z_4^k) \in \mathbb{Q}\pi^{2m+4j+4k}$$

for all $j,k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. Observe that

$$Z\bigl(z_2^m \widetilde{ш} (z_3z_1)^j\bigr) = \sum_{\substack{\sum_{i=0}^{2j} m_i = m\\ m_0,\dots,m_{2j}\geq 0}} \zeta(\{2\}^{m_0}, 3, \{2\}^{m_1}, 1, \dots, 3, \{2\}^{m_{2j-1}}, 1, \{2\}^{m_{2j}}) \in \mathbb{Q}\pi^{2m+4j}$$

by Bowman-Bradley [BB02] and that

$$\overline{Z}(z_4^k) = \zeta^\star(\{4\}^k) \in \mathbb{Q}\pi^{4k}$$

by Muneta [Mun08]. These observations complete the proof. $\square$

Now we give a proof of our main theorem (Theorem 2.13), assuming Theorem 2.14:

Proof of Theorem 2.13. We proceed by induction on $m+n$ and note that the theorem is obvious if $m+n=0$, in which case the only possibility is $m=n=0$.

Apply Z to Theorem 2.14 and substitute $(a,b,c)=(3,1,2)$ to get

$$\sum_{\substack{i+p+2q=m\\ j+u_1+\cdots+u_p\\ +v_1+\cdots+v_q=n}} (-2)^p \overline{Z}\bigl(z_2^i \mathbin{\widetilde{ш}} (z_3z_1)^j\bigr) Z(z_{4u_1+2}\cdots z_{4u_p+2} \mathbin{\widetilde{ш}} z_{4v_1+4}\cdots z_{4v_q+4})$$
$$= (-1)^m \sum_{j+k=n} Z\bigl(z_2^m \mathbin{\widetilde{ш}} (z_3z_1)^j\bigr)\overline{Z}(z_4^k),$$

whose right-hand side belongs to $\mathbb{Q}\pi^{2m+4n}$ by Lemma 2.21. The left-hand side is

$$\sum_{i=0}^{m}\sum_{j=0}^{n} \overline{Z}\bigl(z_2^i \mathbin{\widetilde{ш}} (z_3z_1)^j\bigr) \sum_{\substack{p+2q=m-i\\ k+l=n-j}} (-2)^p \sum_{\substack{u_1+\cdots+u_p=k\\ v_1+\cdots+v_q=l}} Z(z_{4u_1+2}\cdots z_{4u_p+2} \mathbin{\widetilde{ш}} z_{4v_1+4}\cdots z_{4v_q+4})$$
$$\in \overline{Z}\bigl(z_2^m \mathbin{\widetilde{ш}} (z_3z_1)^n\bigr) + \mathbb{Q}\pi^{2m+4n}$$

by the inductive hypothesis and Lemma 2.20 because if $p+2q=m-i$ and $k+l=n-j$, then $(2i+4j)+(2p+4q+4k+4l)=2m+4n$. This completes the proof. $\square$

2.3. **Reduction to an identity in a larger algebra.** In order to prove Theorem 2.14, we find it convenient to consider an algebra larger than $\mathfrak{H}^1$. Let $\mathcal{M}$ denote the sub-semigroup $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^3 \setminus \{(0,0,0)\}$ of $\mathbb{Z}^3$, and $\mathcal{A}$ the non-commutative polynomial algebra $\mathbb{Q}\langle x_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \mathcal{M}\rangle$.

Write $\mathcal{I}$ for the set of all finite sequences of elements of $\mathcal{M}$, including the empty sequence $\emptyset$. For $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_1,\dots,\alpha_l) \in \mathcal{I}$, put $x_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} = x_{\alpha_1}\cdots x_{\alpha_n} \in \mathcal{A}$, where $z_\emptyset = 1$; then $\{x_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} \mid \boldsymbol{\alpha} \in \mathcal{I}\}$ is a $\mathbb{Q}$-vector space basis for $\mathcal{A}$.

We may define a $\mathbb{Q}$-linear transformation d on $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathbb{Q}$-bilinear maps $*, \widetilde{ш} \colon \mathcal{A}\times\mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{A}$ analogously as we did on $\mathfrak{H}^1$. Then for any $a,b,c \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$, the algebra homomorphism $\mathcal{A} \to \mathfrak{H}^1$ defined by $x_\alpha \mapsto z_{ap+bq+cr}$ for $\alpha = (p,q,r) \in \mathcal{M}$ commutes with d, $*$ and $\widetilde{ш}$. Therefore, in order to prove Theorem 2.14, it suffices to show the following identity in $\mathcal{A}$:

Theorem 2.22. *For all* $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$*, we have*

$$\sum_{\substack{i+p+2q=m\\ j+u_1+\cdots+u_p\\ +v_1+\cdots+v_q=n}} (-2)^p d\bigl(x_{e_3}^i \mathbin{\widetilde{\text{ш}}} (x_{e_1}x_{e_2})^j\bigr) * \bigl(x_{(u_1,u_1,1)}\cdots x_{(u_p,u_p,1)} \mathbin{\widetilde{\text{ш}}} x_{(v_1,v_1,2)}\cdots x_{(v_q,v_q,2)}\bigr)$$
$$= (-1)^m \sum_{j+k=n} \bigl(x_{e_3}^m \mathbin{\widetilde{\text{ш}}} (x_{e_1}x_{e_2})^j\bigr) * d(x_{(1,1,0)}^k),$$

where $e_1 = (1,0,0)$*,* $e_2 = (0,1,0)$*,* $e_3 = (0,0,1)$*.*

2.4. **Reduction to an identity in an algebra of formal power series.**

Definition 2.23. For $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_l) \in \mathcal{I}$, its *weight* $\operatorname{wt}\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ and *depth* $\operatorname{dp}\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ are defined by $\operatorname{wt}\boldsymbol{\alpha} = \alpha_1 + \cdots + \alpha_l \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^3$ and $\operatorname{dp}\boldsymbol{\alpha} = l \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, where the empty sequence $\emptyset$ is understood to have weight $0 = (0,0,0)$ and depth 0. For $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^3$, the set of all $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in \mathcal{I}$ of weight α is denoted by $\mathcal{I}_{\mathrm{wt}=\alpha}$, and the $\mathbb{Q}$-vector subspace of $\mathcal{A}$ generated by $\{x_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} \mid \boldsymbol{\alpha} \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathrm{wt}=\alpha}\}$ is denoted by $\mathcal{A}_{\mathrm{wt}=\alpha}$.

Proposition 2.24. *If* $w \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathrm{wt}=\alpha}$ *and* $w' \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathrm{wt}=\alpha'}$*, then* $d(w) \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathrm{wt}=\alpha}$ *and* $w * w', w \mathbin{\widetilde{\text{ш}}} w' \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathrm{wt}=\alpha+\alpha'}$*.*

Proof. We only prove that $d(w) \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathrm{wt}=\alpha}$; the other assertions can be shown in a similar manner. We may assume that $w = x_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$, where $\operatorname{wt}\boldsymbol{\alpha} = \alpha$. Put $k = \operatorname{dp}\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ and write $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k)$. Let $(l, \sigma) \in S_k^d$ and define $\boldsymbol{\beta} = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_l)$ by $\beta_t = \sum_{s\in\sigma^{-1}(t)} \alpha_s$. Then we have

$$\operatorname{wt}\boldsymbol{\beta} = \sum_{t=1}^{l} \beta_t = \sum_{t=1}^{l} \sum_{s\in\sigma^{-1}(t)} \alpha_s = \sum_{s=1}^{k} \alpha_s = \operatorname{wt}\boldsymbol{\alpha} = \alpha.$$

It follows that $x_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathrm{wt}=\alpha}$, which completes the proof. □

The proposition above implies that both sides in Theorem 2.22 have weight (n, n, m). Therefore it suffices to show that

$$\sum_{m,n} \sum_{\substack{i+p+2q=m\\ j+u_1+\cdots+u_p\\ +v_1+\cdots+v_q=n}} (-2)^p d\bigl(x_{e_3}^i \mathbin{\widetilde{\text{ш}}} (x_{e_1}x_{e_2})^j\bigr) * \bigl(x_{(u_1,u_1,1)}\cdots x_{(u_p,u_p,1)} \mathbin{\widetilde{\text{ш}}} x_{(v_1,v_1,2)}\cdots x_{(v_q,v_q,2)}\bigr)$$
$$= \sum_{m,n} (-1)^m \sum_{j+k=n} \bigl(x_{e_3}^m \mathbin{\widetilde{\text{ш}}} (x_{e_1}x_{e_2})^j\bigr) * d(x_{(1,1,0)}^k)$$

in the algebra $\mathbb{Q}\langle\langle x_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \mathcal{M}\rangle\rangle$ of formal power series. Observe that d, $*$ and $\mathbin{\widetilde{\text{ш}}}$ are well defined in $\mathbb{Q}\langle\langle x_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \mathcal{M}\rangle\rangle$. It follows that the following theorem implies our main theorem:

Theorem 2.25. *We have*

$$\sum_{i,j,p,q,u_1,\dots,u_p,v_1,\dots,v_q} (-2)^p d\bigl(x_{e_3}^i \mathbin{\widetilde{\text{ш}}} (x_{e_1}x_{e_2})^j\bigr) * \bigl(x_{(u_1,u_1,1)}\cdots x_{(u_p,u_p,1)} \mathbin{\widetilde{\text{ш}}} x_{(v_1,v_1,2)}\cdots x_{(v_q,v_q,2)}\bigr)$$
$$= \sum_{j,k,m} (-1)^m \bigl(x_{e_3}^m \mathbin{\widetilde{\text{ш}}} (x_{e_1}x_{e_2})^j\bigr) * d(x_{(1,1,0)}^k)$$

in $\mathbb{Q}\langle\langle x_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \mathcal{M}\rangle\rangle$*.*

3. Proof of Theorem 2.25

This section will be devoted to the proof of Theorem 2.25 by expanding both sides.

3.1. Basic properties of the operations.

Definition 3.1. We say that $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_l) \in \mathcal{I}$ is *good* if, writing $\alpha_s = (a_s, b_s, c_s)$ for $s \in [l]$, we have $\sum_{s=1}^{s'}(a_s - b_s) \in \{0, 1\}$ for all $s' \in [l]$ and $\sum_{s=1}^{l}(a_s - b_s) = 0$. The set of all good $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in \mathcal{I}$ is denoted by $\mathcal{I}^{\mathrm{G}}$, and write $\mathcal{A}^{\mathrm{G}} = \{\sum_{\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in \mathcal{I}^{\mathrm{G}}} q_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} x_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} \mid q_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} \in \mathbb{Q}\}$, which is a $\mathbb{Q}$-vector subspace of $\mathbb{Q}\langle\langle x_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \mathcal{M} \rangle\rangle$.

We say that $\alpha \in \mathcal{M}$ is *great* if, writing $\alpha = (a, b, c)$, we have $|a - b| \le 1$. The set of all great $\alpha \in \mathcal{M}$ is denoted by $\mathcal{M}^{\mathrm{G}}$.

Lemma 3.2. *If $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_l) \in \mathcal{I}$ is good, then α_s is great for all $s \in [l]$.*

Proof. Obvious. □

Proposition 3.3. *If $w, w' \in \mathcal{A}^{\mathrm{G}}$, then $d(w), w * w', w \mathbin{\widetilde{ш}} w' \in \mathcal{A}^{\mathrm{G}}$.*

Proof. We only prove that $d(w) \in \mathcal{A}^{\mathrm{G}}$; the other assertions can be shown in a similar manner. We may assume that $w = x_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$, where $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in \mathcal{I}^{\mathrm{G}}$. Put $k = \operatorname{dp} \boldsymbol{\alpha}$ and write $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k)$ and $\alpha_s = (a_s, b_s, c_s)$ for $s \in [k]$. Let $(l, \sigma) \in S_k^d$ and define $\boldsymbol{\beta} = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_l)$ by $\beta_t = \sum_{s \in \sigma^{-1}(t)} \alpha_s$. If we write $\beta_t = (\tilde{a}_t, \tilde{b}_t, \tilde{c}_t)$ for $t \in [l]$, then

$$\sum_{t=1}^{t'} (\tilde{a}_t - \tilde{b}_t) = \sum_{t=1}^{t'} \sum_{s \in \sigma^{-1}(t)} (a_s - b_s) = \sum_{s=1}^{\max \sigma^{-1}(t')} (a_s - b_s) \in \{0, 1\}$$

for all $t' \in [l]$ because $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ is good. It follows that $x_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \in \mathcal{A}^{\mathrm{G}}$, which completes the proof. □

Corollary 3.4. *Both sides in Theorem 2.25 belong to $\mathcal{A}^{\mathrm{G}}$.*

Proof. The corollary follows from Proposition 3.3 and the observation that $x_{e_3}^i$, $(x_{e_1} x_{e_2})^j$, $x_{(1,1,0)}^k$, $x_{(u_1,u_1,1)} \cdots x_{(u_p,u_p,1)}$ and $x_{(v_1,v_1,2)} \cdots x_{(v_q,v_q,2)}$ all belong to $\mathcal{A}^{\mathrm{G}}$. □

Definition 3.5. For $\mathcal{M}' \subset \mathcal{M}$, write $\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{M}'}$ for the set of all $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in \mathcal{I}$ whose components are all in $\mathcal{M}'$, and put $\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{M}'}^{\mathrm{G}} = \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{M}'} \cap \mathcal{I}^{\mathrm{G}}$.

Lemma 3.6. *Let $\mathcal{M}', \mathcal{M}'' \subset \mathcal{M}$ and suppose that $\mathcal{M}'' \subset \{(a, a, b) \mid a, b \in \mathbb{Z}_{\ge 0}\}$. Given $A_\beta, B_\gamma \in \mathbb{Q}$ for each $\beta \in \mathcal{M}'$ and $\gamma \in \mathcal{M}''$, write*

$$A_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = \prod_{s=1}^{\operatorname{dp} \boldsymbol{\beta}} A_{\beta_s}, \qquad B_{\boldsymbol{\gamma}} = \prod_{t=1}^{\operatorname{dp} \boldsymbol{\gamma}} B_{\gamma_t}$$

for $\boldsymbol{\beta} = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_{\operatorname{dp} \boldsymbol{\beta}}) \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{M}'}$ and $\boldsymbol{\gamma} = (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_{\operatorname{dp} \boldsymbol{\gamma}}) \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{M}''}$. Then we have

$$\sum_{\boldsymbol{\beta} \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{M}'}^{\mathrm{G}}} \sum_{\boldsymbol{\gamma} \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{M}''}} A_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} B_{\boldsymbol{\gamma}} (x_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} * x_{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}) = \sum_{\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_l) \in \mathcal{I}^{\mathrm{G}}} \left(\prod_{s=1}^{l} \sum_{\substack{\beta \in \mathcal{M}' \cup \{0\} \\ \gamma \in \mathcal{M}'' \cup \{0\} \\ \beta + \gamma = \alpha_s}} A_\beta B_\gamma \right) x_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}},$$

where we define $A_0 = B_0 = 1$.

Proof. Since $\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{M}''} \subset \mathcal{I}^{\mathrm{G}}$ by assumption, the left-hand side belongs to $\mathcal{A}^{\mathrm{G}}$ because of Proposition 3.3. Therefore it suffices to show that for each $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_l) \in \mathcal{I}^{\mathrm{G}}$, the coefficient of $x_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ in the left-hand side is equal to

$$\prod_{s=1}^{l} \sum_{\substack{\beta \in \mathcal{M}' \cup \{0\} \\ \gamma \in \mathcal{M}'' \cup \{0\} \\ \beta + \gamma = \alpha_s}} A_\beta B_\gamma = \sum_{\substack{\tilde{\beta}_1, \dots, \tilde{\beta}_l \in \mathcal{M}' \cup \{0\} \\ \tilde{\gamma}_1, \dots, \tilde{\gamma}_l \in \mathcal{M}'' \cup \{0\} \\ \tilde{\beta}_s + \tilde{\gamma}_s = \alpha_s \text{ for } s \in [l]}} A_{\tilde{\beta}_1} \cdots A_{\tilde{\beta}_l} B_{\tilde{\gamma}_1} \cdots B_{\tilde{\gamma}_l}.$$

In the left-hand side, each $(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}, \sigma, \tau)$ with $\boldsymbol{\beta} = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_{\mathrm{dp}\,\boldsymbol{\beta}}) \in \mathcal{I}^{\mathrm{G}}_{\mathcal{M}'}$, $\boldsymbol{\gamma} = (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_{\mathrm{dp}\,\boldsymbol{\gamma}}) \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{M}''}$, $(\mathrm{dp}\,\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \sigma, \tau) \in S^*_{\mathrm{dp}\,\boldsymbol{\beta}, \mathrm{dp}\,\boldsymbol{\gamma}}$ satisfying $\alpha_s = \sum_{t \in \sigma^{-1}(s)} \beta_t + \sum_{u \in \tau^{-1}(s)} \gamma_u$ for $s \in [l]$ yields the coefficient $A_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} B_{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}$. For each such $(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}, \sigma, \tau)$, define $\tilde{\beta}_s \in \mathcal{M}' \cup \{0\}$ for $s \in [l]$ by

$$\tilde{\beta}_s = \begin{cases} \beta_t & \text{if } s \in \operatorname{Im} \sigma \text{ and } \sigma(t) = s; \\ 0 & \text{if } s \notin \operatorname{Im} \sigma. \end{cases}$$

Define $\tilde{\gamma}_s \in \mathcal{M}'' \cup \{0\}$ for $s \in [l]$ in a similar manner. Then we have $\tilde{\beta}_s + \tilde{\gamma}_s = \alpha_s$ for all $s \in [l]$, and

$$A_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} B_{\boldsymbol{\gamma}} = A_{\tilde{\beta}_1} \cdots A_{\tilde{\beta}_l} B_{\tilde{\gamma}_1} \cdots B_{\tilde{\gamma}_l}.$$

Conversely, let $\tilde{\beta}_1, \dots, \tilde{\beta}_l \in \mathcal{M}' \cup \{0\}$ and $\tilde{\gamma}_1, \dots, \tilde{\gamma}_l \in \mathcal{M}'' \cup \{0\}$ be given so that $\tilde{\beta}_s + \tilde{\gamma}_s = \alpha_s$ for all $s \in [l]$. Let $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ be the sequence $(\tilde{\beta}_1, \dots, \tilde{\beta}_l)$ with all zero components removed, and define $\sigma\colon [\mathrm{dp}\,\boldsymbol{\beta}] \to [l]$ by setting $\sigma(t) = s$ if the t-th component of $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ was originally $\tilde{\beta}_s$. Note that the goodness of $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ implies that of $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ thanks to the assumption on $\mathcal{M}''$. Defining $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ and τ in a similar fashion, we may see that this gives the desired one-to-one correspondence. □

3.2. **Expansion of the right-hand side.**

Definition 3.7. For a finite subset A of $\mathbb{Z}$, denote by A_{odd} and A_{even} the sets of all odd and even elements of A respectively, and by $|A|$ the cardinality of A.

Definition 3.8. For $a \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, set $\mathcal{M}_a = \{(b, b, a) \mid b \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\} \setminus \{(0, 0, 0)\}$.

Lemma 3.9. *We have*

$$\sum_k d(x^k_{(1,1,0)}) = \sum_{\boldsymbol{\gamma} \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{M}_0}} x_{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}.$$

Proof. Since

$$\sum_k d(x^k_{(1,1,0)}) = \sum_k \sum_{(l,\sigma) \in S^d_k} x_{\boldsymbol{\gamma}},$$

where $\boldsymbol{\gamma} = (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_l) \in \mathcal{I}$ is given by

$$\gamma_i = \bigl(|\sigma^{-1}(i)|, |\sigma^{-1}(i)|, 0\bigr) \in \mathcal{M}_0,$$

we only need to show that the map $(k, l, \sigma) \mapsto \boldsymbol{\gamma}$ is a bijection onto $\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{M}_0}$. Let $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{M}_0}$ be given. Set $l = \mathrm{dp}\,\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ and write $\boldsymbol{\gamma} = (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_l)$. Put $k = (\mathrm{wt}\,\boldsymbol{\gamma}) \cdot e_1$, and define $\sigma\colon [k] \to [l]$ by

$$\sigma(s) = \min\{i \in [l] \mid s \leq (\gamma_1 + \cdots + \gamma_i) \cdot e_1\}.$$

It is easily seen that this gives the inverse, which completes the proof. □

Lemma 3.10. *We have*

$$\sum_{j,m}(-1)^m\bigl(x_{e_3}^m \mathbin{\widetilde{\text{ш}}} (x_{e_1}x_{e_2})^j\bigr) = \sum_{\boldsymbol{\beta}\in\mathcal{I}^{\mathrm{G}}_{\{e_1,e_2,e_3\}}} (-1)^{(\mathrm{wt}\,\boldsymbol{\beta})\cdot e_3} x_{\boldsymbol{\beta}}.$$

Proof. Since

$$\sum_{j,m}(-1)^m\bigl(x_{e_3}^m \mathbin{\widetilde{\text{ш}}} (x_{e_1}x_{e_2})^j\bigr) = \sum_{j,m}\sum_{(l,\sigma,\tau)\in S^{\widetilde{\text{ш}}}_{m,2j}} (-1)^m x_{\boldsymbol{\beta}},$$

where $\boldsymbol{\beta}=(\beta_1,\dots,\beta_l)\in\mathcal{I}$ is given by

$$\beta_i = \begin{cases} e_3 & \text{if } i\in\operatorname{Im}\sigma;\\ e_1 & \text{if } i\in\tau([2j]_{\mathrm{odd}});\\ e_2 & \text{if } i\in\tau([2j]_{\mathrm{even}}),\end{cases}$$

we only need to show that the map $(j,m,l,\sigma,\tau)\mapsto\boldsymbol{\beta}$ is a bijection onto $\mathcal{I}^{\mathrm{G}}_{\{e_1,e_2,e_3\}}$, because the coefficients are seen to agree by the observation that

$$(-1)^m = (-1)^{|\{i\in[l]\mid\beta_i=e_3\}|} = (-1)^{(\mathrm{wt}\,\boldsymbol{\beta})\cdot e_3}.$$

Let $\boldsymbol{\beta}\in\mathcal{I}^{\mathrm{G}}_{\{e_1,e_2,e_3\}}$ be given. Set $l=\operatorname{dp}\boldsymbol{\beta}$ and write $\boldsymbol{\beta}=(\beta_1,\dots,\beta_l)$. Put $j=(\mathrm{wt}\,\boldsymbol{\beta})\cdot e_1$ and $m=(\mathrm{wt}\,\boldsymbol{\beta})\cdot e_3$, and define $\sigma\colon[m]\to[l]$ and $\tau\colon[2j]\to[l]$ by

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma(s) &= s\text{-th smallest element in } \{i\in[l]\mid\beta_i=e_3\},\\ \tau(t) &= t\text{-th smallest element in } \{i\in[l]\mid\beta_i=e_1,e_2\}.\end{aligned}$$

It is easily seen that this gives the inverse, which completes the proof. □

Definition 3.11. Define

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{N} &= \{(a,a,0)\mid a\in\mathbb{Z}_{\geq1}\}\cup\{(a+1,a,0)\mid a\in\mathbb{Z}_{\geq0}\}\\ &\quad\cup\{(a,a+1,0)\mid a\in\mathbb{Z}_{\geq0}\}\cup\{(a,a,1)\mid a\in\mathbb{Z}_{\geq0}\}\\ &\subset\mathcal{M}^{\mathrm{G}}.\end{aligned}$$

Lemma 3.12. *We have*

$$\sum_{j,k,m}(-1)^m\bigl(x_{e_3}^m \mathbin{\widetilde{\text{ш}}} (x_{e_1}x_{e_2})^j\bigr) * d(x^k_{(1,1,0)}) = \sum_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}\in\mathcal{I}^{\mathrm{G}}_{\mathcal{N}}} (-1)^{(\mathrm{wt}\,\boldsymbol{\alpha})\cdot e_3} x_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}.$$

Proof. Lemmas 3.9 and 3.10 show that

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{j,k,m}(-1)^m\bigl(x_{e_3}^m \mathbin{\widetilde{\text{ш}}} (x_{e_1}x_{e_2})^j\bigr) * d(x^k_{(1,1,0)})\\ &\quad= \left(\sum_{j,m}(-1)^m\bigl(x_{e_3}^m \mathbin{\widetilde{\text{ш}}} (x_{e_1}x_{e_2})^j\bigr)\right) * \left(\sum_k d(x^k_{(1,1,0)})\right)\\ &\quad= \left(\sum_{\boldsymbol{\beta}\in\mathcal{I}^{\mathrm{G}}_{\{e_1,e_2,e_3\}}} (-1)^{(\mathrm{wt}\,\boldsymbol{\beta})\cdot e_3} x_{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\right) * \left(\sum_{\boldsymbol{\gamma}\in\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{M}_0}} x_{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}\right)\\ &\quad= \sum_{\boldsymbol{\beta}\in\mathcal{I}^{\mathrm{G}}_{\{e_1,e_2,e_3\}}}\sum_{\boldsymbol{\gamma}\in\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{M}_0}} (-1)^{(\mathrm{wt}\,\boldsymbol{\beta})\cdot e_3}(x_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} * x_{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}).\end{aligned}$$

Applying Lemma 3.6 with $\mathcal{M}' = \{e_1, e_2, e_3\}$, $\mathcal{M}'' = \mathcal{M}_0$, $A_\beta = (-1)^{\beta\cdot e_3}$ and $B_\gamma = 1$ gives

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{\boldsymbol{\beta}\in\mathcal{I}^{\mathrm{G}}_{\{e_1,e_2,e_3\}}} \sum_{\boldsymbol{\gamma}\in\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{M}_0}} &(-1)^{(\mathrm{wt}\,\boldsymbol{\beta})\cdot e_3}(x_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} * x_{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}) \\ &= \sum_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}=(\alpha_1,\dots,\alpha_l)\in\mathcal{I}^{\mathrm{G}}} \left(\prod_{s=1}^{l} \sum_{\substack{\beta\in\{e_1,e_2,e_3,0\}\\ \gamma\in\mathcal{M}_0\cup\{0\}\\ \beta+\gamma=\alpha_s}} (-1)^{\beta\cdot e_3}\right) x_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}.\end{aligned}$$

For $\alpha = (a, b, c) \in \mathcal{M}^{\mathrm{G}}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{\substack{\beta\in\{e_1,e_2,e_3,0\}\\ \gamma\in\mathcal{M}_0\cup\{0\}\\ \beta+\gamma=\alpha}} (-1)^{\beta\cdot e_3} &= \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } c = 0; \\ -1 & \text{if } a = b \text{ and } c = 1; \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} (-1)^{\alpha\cdot e_3} & \text{if } \alpha\in\mathcal{N}; \\ 0 & \text{if } \alpha\notin\mathcal{N}. \end{cases}\end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\sum_{j,k,m} (-1)^m \left(x_{e_3}^m \,\widetilde{\sqcup\!\sqcup}\, (x_{e_1}x_{e_2})^j\right) * d(x_{(1,1,0)}^k) = \sum_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}\in\mathcal{I}^{\mathrm{G}}_{\mathcal{N}}} (-1)^{(\mathrm{wt}\,\boldsymbol{\alpha})\cdot e_3} x_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}.$$

□

3.3. **Expansion of the left-hand side.**

Definition 3.13. For $\boldsymbol{\gamma} = (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_l) \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{M}_1\cup\mathcal{M}_2}$, define

$$\mathrm{char}\,\boldsymbol{\gamma} = |\{s\in[l] \mid \gamma_s\cdot e_3 = 1\}|.$$

Lemma 3.14. *We have*

$$\sum_{p,q,u_1,\dots,u_p,v_1,\dots,v_q} (-2)^p (x_{(u_1,u_1,1)}\cdots x_{(u_p,u_p,1)} \widetilde{\sqcup\!\sqcup} x_{(v_1,v_1,2)}\cdots x_{(v_q,v_q,2)}) = \sum_{\boldsymbol{\gamma}\in\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{M}_1\cup\mathcal{M}_2}} (-2)^{\mathrm{char}\,\boldsymbol{\gamma}} x_{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}.$$

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{p,q,u_1,\dots,u_p,v_1,\dots,v_q} &(-2)^p (x_{(u_1,u_1,1)}\cdots x_{(u_p,u_p,1)} \,\widetilde{\sqcup\!\sqcup}\, x_{(v_1,v_1,2)}\cdots x_{(v_q,v_q,2)}) \\ &= \left(\sum_{p,u_1,\dots,u_p} (-2)^p x_{(u_1,u_1,1)}\cdots x_{(u_p,u_p,1)}\right) \widetilde{\sqcup\!\sqcup} \left(\sum_{q,v_1,\dots,v_q} x_{(v_1,v_1,2)}\cdots x_{(v_q,v_q,2)}\right) \\ &= \left(\sum_{\boldsymbol{\gamma}_1\in\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{M}_1}} (-2)^{\mathrm{dp}\,\boldsymbol{\gamma}_1} x_{\boldsymbol{\gamma}_1}\right) \widetilde{\sqcup\!\sqcup} \left(\sum_{\boldsymbol{\gamma}_2\in\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{M}_2}} x_{\boldsymbol{\gamma}_2}\right) \\ &= \sum_{\boldsymbol{\gamma}_1\in\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{M}_1}} \sum_{\boldsymbol{\gamma}_2\in\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{M}_2}} (-2)^{\mathrm{dp}\,\boldsymbol{\gamma}_1} (x_{\boldsymbol{\gamma}_1} \,\widetilde{\sqcup\!\sqcup}\, x_{\boldsymbol{\gamma}_2}) \\ &= \sum_{\boldsymbol{\gamma}\in\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{M}_1\cup\mathcal{M}_2}} (-2)^{\mathrm{char}\,\boldsymbol{\gamma}} x_{\boldsymbol{\gamma}},\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from the observation that if $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_1 = (\gamma_{1,1}, \dots, \gamma_{1,\operatorname{dp}\boldsymbol{\gamma}_1}) \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{M}_1}$, $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_2 = (\gamma_{2,1}, \dots, \gamma_{2,\operatorname{dp}\boldsymbol{\gamma}_2}) \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{M}_2}$ and $(l, \sigma_1, \sigma_2) \in S^{\widetilde{ш}}_{\operatorname{dp}\boldsymbol{\gamma}_1, \operatorname{dp}\boldsymbol{\gamma}_2}$, and if we define $\boldsymbol{\gamma} = (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_l) \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{M}_1 \cup \mathcal{M}_2}$ by

$$\gamma_s = \sum_{t \in \sigma_1^{-1}(s)} \gamma_{1,t} + \sum_{t \in \sigma_2^{-1}(s)} \gamma_{2,t},$$

then

$$\gamma_s \cdot e_3 = \begin{cases} \gamma_{1,t} \cdot e_3 = 1 & \text{if } s \in \operatorname{Im}\sigma_1 \text{ and } s = \sigma_1(t); \\ \gamma_{2,t} \cdot e_3 = 2 & \text{if } s \in \operatorname{Im}\sigma_2 \text{ and } s = \sigma_2(t), \end{cases}$$

and so

$$\operatorname{char}\boldsymbol{\gamma} = |\{s \in [l] \mid \gamma_s \cdot e_3 = 1\}| = |\operatorname{Im}\sigma_1| = \operatorname{dp}\boldsymbol{\gamma}_1.$$

□

Definition 3.15. For $\alpha = (a, b, c) \in \mathcal{M}$, write

$$\langle \alpha \rangle = \binom{a+b+c}{c} = \frac{(a+b+c)!}{(a+b)!c!} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}.$$

For $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_l) \in \mathcal{I}$, write $\langle \boldsymbol{\alpha} \rangle = \prod_{i=1}^{l} \langle \alpha_i \rangle \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$, where $\langle \emptyset \rangle = 1$.

Lemma 3.16. *We have*

$$\sum_{i,j} d\bigl(x_{e_3}^i \mathbin{\widetilde{ш}} (x_{e_1} x_{e_2})^j\bigr) = \sum_{\boldsymbol{\beta} \in \mathcal{I}^{\mathrm{G}}} \langle \boldsymbol{\beta} \rangle x_{\boldsymbol{\beta}}.$$

Proof. Since

$$\sum_{i,j} (x_{e_3}^i \mathbin{\widetilde{ш}} (x_{e_1} x_{e_2})^j) = \sum_{\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in \mathcal{I}^{\mathrm{G}}_{\{e_1, e_2, e_3\}}} x_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$$

by a reasoning similar to the one used in the proof of Lemma 3.10, we have

$$\sum_{i,j} d\bigl(x_{e_3}^i \mathbin{\widetilde{ш}} (x_{e_1} x_{e_2})^j\bigr) = \sum_{\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in \mathcal{I}^{\mathrm{G}}_{\{e_1, e_2, e_3\}}} d(x_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}) = \sum_{\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in \mathcal{I}^{\mathrm{G}}_{\{e_1, e_2, e_3\}}} \sum_{(l,\sigma) \in S^d_{\operatorname{dp}\boldsymbol{\alpha}}} x_{\boldsymbol{\beta}},$$

where $\boldsymbol{\beta} = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_l) \in \mathcal{I}^{\mathrm{G}}$ is given by

$$\beta_s = \sum_{t \in \sigma^{-1}(s)} \alpha_t$$

if we write $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{\operatorname{dp}\boldsymbol{\alpha}})$. It suffices to prove that for each $\boldsymbol{\beta} \in \mathcal{I}^{\mathrm{G}}$, there are $\langle \boldsymbol{\beta} \rangle$ triples $(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, l, \sigma)$ that yield $\boldsymbol{\beta}$.

Let $\boldsymbol{\beta} \in \mathcal{I}^{\mathrm{G}}$ be given. Set $l = \operatorname{dp}\boldsymbol{\beta}$ and write $\boldsymbol{\beta} = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_l)$ and $\beta_s = (a_s, b_s, c_s)$ for $s \in [l]$. The depth of $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ is uniquely determined because

$$\operatorname{dp}\boldsymbol{\alpha} = \operatorname{wt}\boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot (1,1,1) = \operatorname{wt}\boldsymbol{\beta} \cdot (1,1,1).$$

The map σ is also uniquely determined because for every $s \in [l]$, we have

$$|\sigma^{-1}(s)| = \sum_{t \in \sigma^{-1}(s)} \alpha_t \cdot (1,1,1) = \beta_s \cdot (1,1,1) = a_s + b_s + c_s.$$

Therefore choosing an appropriate $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ is equivalent to choosing, for each $s \in [l]$, from $a_s + b_s + c_s$ components c_s components to be occupied by e_3, because then the goodness of $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ determines how to allocate the remaining $a_s + b_s$ components to e_1 and e_2. It follows that the number of suitable $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ is

$$\prod_{s=1}^{l} \binom{a_s + b_s + c_s}{c_s} = \langle \boldsymbol{\beta} \rangle.$$

$\square$

Lemma 3.17. *We have*

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i,j,p,q,u_1,\dots,u_p,v_1,\dots,v_q} & (-2)^p d\big(x_{e_3}^i \mathbin{\widetilde{\shuffle}} (x_{e_1}x_{e_2})^j\big) * \big(x_{(u_1,u_1,1)} \cdots x_{(u_p,u_p,1)} \mathbin{\widetilde{\shuffle}} x_{(v_1,v_1,2)} \cdots x_{(v_q,v_q,2)}\big) \\ &= \sum_{\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{N}}^{\mathrm{G}}} (-1)^{(\mathrm{wt}\,\boldsymbol{\alpha})\cdot e_3} x_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}.\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Lemmas 3.14 and 3.16 show that

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i,j,p,q,u_1,\dots,u_p,v_1,\dots,v_q} & (-2)^p d\big(x_{e_3}^i \mathbin{\widetilde{\shuffle}} (x_{e_1}x_{e_2})^j\big) * \big(x_{(u_1,u_1,1)} \cdots x_{(u_p,u_p,1)} \mathbin{\widetilde{\shuffle}} x_{(v_1,v_1,2)} \cdots x_{(v_q,v_q,2)}\big) \\ &= \left(\sum_{i,j} d\big(x_{e_3}^i \mathbin{\widetilde{\shuffle}} (x_{e_1}x_{e_2})^j\big) \right) \\ &\qquad * \left(\sum_{p,q,u_1,\dots,u_p,v_1,\dots,v_q} (-2)^p \big(x_{(u_1,u_1,1)} \cdots x_{(u_p,u_p,1)} \mathbin{\widetilde{\shuffle}} x_{(v_1,v_1,2)} \cdots x_{(v_q,v_q,2)}\big) \right) \\ &= \left(\sum_{\boldsymbol{\beta} \in \mathcal{I}^{\mathrm{G}}} \langle \boldsymbol{\beta} \rangle x_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \right) * \left(\sum_{\boldsymbol{\gamma} \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{M}_1 \cup \mathcal{M}_2}} (-2)^{\mathrm{char}\,\boldsymbol{\gamma}} x_{\boldsymbol{\gamma}} \right) \\ &= \sum_{\boldsymbol{\beta} \in \mathcal{I}^{\mathrm{G}}} \sum_{\boldsymbol{\gamma} \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{M}_1 \cup \mathcal{M}_2}} \langle \boldsymbol{\beta} \rangle (-2)^{\mathrm{char}\,\boldsymbol{\gamma}} (x_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} * x_{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}).\end{aligned}$$

Applying Lemma 3.6 with $\mathcal{M}' = \mathcal{M}$, $\mathcal{M}'' = \mathcal{M}_1 \cup \mathcal{M}_2$, $A_\beta = \langle \beta \rangle$ and $B_\gamma = (-2)^{\chi_{\{1\}}(\gamma \cdot e_3)}$ gives

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{\boldsymbol{\beta} \in \mathcal{I}^{\mathrm{G}}} & \sum_{\boldsymbol{\gamma} \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{M}_1 \cup \mathcal{M}_2}} \langle \boldsymbol{\beta} \rangle (-2)^{\mathrm{char}\,\boldsymbol{\gamma}} (x_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} * x_{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}) \\ &= \sum_{\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_1,\dots,\alpha_l) \in \mathcal{I}^{\mathrm{G}}} \left(\prod_{s=1}^{l} \sum_{\substack{\beta \in \mathcal{M} \cup \{0\} \\ \gamma \in \mathcal{M}_1 \cup \mathcal{M}_2 \cup \{0\} \\ \beta + \gamma = \alpha_s}} \langle \beta \rangle (-2)^{\chi_{\{1\}}(\gamma \cdot e_3)} \right) x_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}},\end{aligned}$$

where $\chi_{\{1\}}$ denotes the characteristic function of $\{1\}$.

For $\alpha = (a, b, c) \in \mathcal{M}^{\mathrm{G}}$, put

$$C_\alpha = \sum_{\substack{\beta \in \mathcal{M} \cup \{0\} \\ \gamma \in \mathcal{M}_1 \cup \mathcal{M}_2 \cup \{0\} \\ \beta + \gamma = \alpha}} \langle \beta \rangle (-2)^{\chi_{\{1\}}(\gamma \cdot e_3)}$$

for simplicity. If $c = 0$, then

$$C_\alpha = \langle \alpha \rangle = \binom{a+b}{0} = 1.$$

If $c = 1$, then

$$\begin{aligned} C_\alpha &= \langle \alpha \rangle - 2 \sum_{k=0}^{\min\{a,b\}} \langle \alpha - (k,k,1) \rangle = \binom{a+b+1}{1} - 2 \sum_{k=0}^{\min\{a,b\}} \binom{a+b-2k}{0} \\ &= (a+b+1) - 2(\min\{a,b\}+1) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } |a-b| = 1; \\ -1 & \text{if } a = b. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

If $c \geq 2$, then, writing $s = a+b+c$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} C_\alpha &= \langle \alpha \rangle - 2 \sum_{k=0}^{\min\{a,b\}} \langle \alpha - (k,k,1) \rangle + \sum_{k=0}^{\min\{a,b\}} \langle \alpha - (k,k,2) \rangle \\ &= \binom{s}{c} - 2 \sum_{k=0}^{\min\{a,b\}} \binom{s-2k-1}{c-1} + \sum_{k=0}^{\min\{a,b\}} \binom{s-2k-2}{c-2} \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{\min\{a,b\}} \left(\binom{s-2k}{c} - \binom{s-2k-2}{c} \right) - 2 \sum_{k=0}^{\min\{a,b\}} \binom{s-2k-1}{c-1} + \sum_{k=0}^{\min\{a,b\}} \binom{s-2k-2}{c-2} \end{aligned}$$

because $s - 2\min\{a,b\} - 2 < c$; therefore $C_\alpha = 0$ because

$$\begin{aligned} &\binom{s-2k}{c} - \binom{s-2k-2}{c} - 2\binom{s-2k-1}{c-1} + \binom{s-2k-2}{c-2} \\ &\quad = \left(\binom{s-2k-1}{c} + \binom{s-2k-1}{c-1} \right) - \left(\binom{s-2k-1}{c} - \binom{s-2k-2}{c-1} \right) \\ &\qquad - 2\binom{s-2k-1}{c-1} + \left(\binom{s-2k-1}{c-1} - \binom{s-2k-2}{c-1} \right) \\ &\quad = 0. \end{aligned}$$

In summary, we have

$$C_\alpha = \begin{cases} (-1)^{\alpha \cdot e_3} & \text{if } \alpha \in \mathcal{N}; \\ 0 & \text{if } \alpha \notin \mathcal{N}. \end{cases}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{i,j,p,q,u_1,\dots,u_p,v_1,\dots,v_q} (-2)^p d\bigl(x_{e_3}^i \,\widetilde{ш}\, (x_{e_1} x_{e_2})^j\bigr) * \bigl(x_{(u_1,u_1,1)} \cdots x_{(u_p,u_p,1)} \,\widetilde{ш}\, x_{(v_1,v_1,2)} \cdots x_{(v_q,v_q,2)}\bigr) \\ &\qquad = \sum_{\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{N}}^{\mathrm{G}}} (-1)^{(\mathrm{wt}\,\boldsymbol{\alpha}) \cdot e_3} x_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemmas 3.12 and 3.17 imply Theorem 2.25, thereby establishing our main theorem.

REFERENCES

[AKO08] T. Aoki, Y. Kombu and Y. Ohno, *A generating function for sums of multiple zeta values and its applications*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **136** (2008), no. 2, 387–395.

[BB02] D. Bowman and D. M. Bradley, *The algebra and combinatorics of shuffles and multiple zeta values*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. A **97** (2002), 43–61.

[BBBL98] J. M. Borwein, D. M. Bradley, D. J. Broadhurst and P. Lisoněk, *Combinatorial aspects of multiple zeta values*, Electron. J. Combin. **5** (1998), Research paper 38, 12 pp.

[Eul68] L. Euler, *Remarques sur un beau rapport entre les series des puissances tant directes que reciproques*, Memoires de l'academie des sciences de Berlin **17** (1768), 83–106.

[KZ01] M. Kontsevich and D. Zagier, *Periods*, Mathematics unlimited—2001 and beyond, 771–808, Springer, Berlin, 2001.

[Hof92] M. Hoffman, *Multiple harmonic series*, Pacific J. Math. **152** (1992), no. 2, 275–290.

[Hof97] M. Hoffman, *The algebra of multiple harmonic series*, J. Algebra **194** (1997), no. 2, 477–495.

[ITTW09] K. Imatomi, T. Tanaka, K. Tasaka and N. Wakabayashi, *On some combinations of multiple zeta-star values*, arXiv:0912.1951.

[Mun08] S. Muneta, *On some explicit evaluations of multiple zeta-star values*, J. Number Theory **128** (2008), no. 9, 2538–2548.

[Mun09] S. Muneta, *A note on evaluations of multiple zeta values*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc, **137** (2009), no. 3, 931–935.

[OZ01] Y. Ohno and D. Zagier, *Multiple zeta values of fixed weight, depth, and height*, Indag. Math. (N.S.) **12** (2001), no. 4, 483–487.

[Yam09] Y. Yamasaki, *Evaluations of multiple Dirichlet L-values via symmetric functions*, J. Number Theory **129** (2009), no. 10, 2369–2386.

[Zlo05] S. A. Zlobin, *Generating functions for the values of a multiple zeta function*, Vestnik Moskov. Univ. Ser. I Mat. Mekh. **2005**, no. 2, 55–59, 73; translation in Moscow Univ. Math. Bull. **60** (2005), no. 2, 44–48.

Nisshin Fire & Marine Insurance Company, Limited, 2–3 Kanda-Surugadai, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo, 101–8329, Japan.
E-mail address: `hiroki.kondou@nisshinfire.co.jp`

Faculty of Mathematics, Kyushu University, 744, Motooka, Nishi-ku, Fukuoka, 819–0395, Japan.
E-mail address: `ssaito@math.kyushu-u.ac.jp`

Faculty of Mathematics, Kyushu University, 744, Motooka, Nishi-ku, Fukuoka, 819–0395, Japan.
E-mail address: `t.tanaka@math.kyushu-u.ac.jp`